

17

A  
S E R M O N  
P R E A C H E D

A T

White-Hall,

Before His Late

M A J E S T Y.

By JOHN TILLOTSON, D.D. and  
Dean of Canterbury.

*Ex dono Philippi Lloyd Militis.*

L O N D O N;

Printed for Brabazon Aylmer, at the Three Pigeons  
against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1686.

Price 3 d.

THE END

White-Hall

1966-1967

Y T S T A M

BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1000000

Printed in the United States of America  
Copyright © 1960 by the American Library Association

67

A SERMON Preach'd at  
White-Hall, &c.

1 Cor. III. 15.

But he himself shall be saved, yet so  
as by fire.

THE Context is thus. According to the  
grace of God which is given unto me,  
as a wise Master-builder, I have laid  
the foundation and another buildeth  
thereon: but let every man take heed how he  
buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no  
man lay, than that which is laid, Jesus Christ.  
Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold,  
silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every  
mans work shall be made manifest, for the day  
shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by  
fire; and the fire shall try every mans work of  
what sort it is. If any mans work abide which he  
hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward.  
If any mans work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss;  
but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

In these Words the Apostle speaks of a sort  
of

of persons, who held indeed the foundation of *Christianity*, but built upon it such *doctrines* or *practices* as would not bear the *trial*; which he expresses to us by *wood, hay, and stubble*, which are not *proof* against the *fire*. Such a person, the Apostle tells us, hath brought himself into a very dangerous state, tho he would not deny the possibility of his salvation: *He himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.*

That by *fire* here is not meant the fire of *Purgatory*, as some pretend (who would be glad of any shadow of a Text of Scripture to countenance their own dreams) I shall neither trouble you nor my self to manifest; since the *particle* of similitude [ *as* ] plainly shews that the Apostle did not intend an escape out of the fire *literally*, but like to that which men make out of a House or Town that is on fire. Especially since very learned persons of the Church of *Rome* do acknowledg that *Purgatory* cannot be concluded from this *Text*, nay all that *Estius* contends for from this *place* is, that it cannot be concluded from hence that there is no *Purgatory*; which we never pretended, but only that this *Text* does not prove it.

It is very well known that this is a Proverbial phrase used not only in Scripture, but in prophane Authors to signifie a *narrow escape out of a great danger*. He shall be saved, yet so as by fire, *sic rupsit, out of the fire*. Just as *Adaptus* is used 1 *Pet.* 3. 20. where the  
Apostle



Apostle speaking of the eight persons of Noah's family who escap'd the flood, *suadentur si salvati sunt* they escaped out of the water. So here this phrase is to be rendred in the Text, *he himself shall escape, yet so as out of the fire.* The like expression you have, *Am. 4. 11. I have pluckt them as a firebrand out of the fire.* And *Jude 23. Others save with fear, plucking them out of the fire.* All which expressions signifie the greatness of the danger and the difficulty of escaping At; as one who when his house at midnight is set on fire, and being suddenly wak'd leaps out of his bed, and runs naked out of the doors, taking nothing that is within along with him, but imploying his whole care to save his body from the flames, as *St. Chrysostom* upon another occasion expresseth it, And so the Roman Orator \* ( who, it is \* *Tully* likely did not think of Purgatory ) useth this phrase; *Quo ex judicio, velut ex incendio, nudus effugit*; From which Judgment or Sentence he escaped naked, as it were out of a burning. And one of the Greek Orators *∴ Aristi* tells us, That to save a man out of the fire, was *d:s.* a common proverbial speech.

From the words thus explained, the Observation that naturally ariseth is this, That men may hold all the Fundamentals of Christian Religion, and yet may superadd other things whereby they may greatly endanger their salvation. What those things were which some among the Corinthians built upon the foundation of

Christianity, whereby they endanger'd their Salvation, we may probably conjecture by what the Apostle reproves in this Epistle, as the tolerating of *incestuous marriages*, communicating in *Idol feasts*, &c. And especially by the doctrine of the false Apostles, who at that time did so much disturb the peace of most Christian Churches, and who are so often and so severely reflected upon in this Epistle. And what their Doctrine was, we have an account *Act. 15. 10.* that they imposed upon the Gentile Christians *Circumcision*, and the observation of the Jewish Law, teaching that unless they were circumcised, and kept the Law of Moses, they could not be saved. So that they did not only build these doctrines upon Christianity, but they made them equal with the Foundation, saying, that unless men believed and practised such things they could not be saved. In speaking to this Observation, I shall reduce my discourse to these two Heads.

I shall present to you some Doctrines and Practices, which have been built upon the Foundation of Christianity, to the great hazard and danger of mens Salvation. And to explain, I mean particularly the Church of Rome. I shall enquire, whether our granting possibility of salvation (tho with great hazard to those in the Communion of the Roman Church, and their denying it to us, be a reasonable argument and encouragement to ap-

man to betake himself to that Church.

And there is the more reason to consider these things, when so many *seducing Spirits* are so active and busie to pervert men from the *truth*; and when we see every day so many men and their *Religion* so easily parted: for this reason these two Considerations shall be the subject of the following discourse.

I. *First.* We will consider some *Doctrines* and *Practices* which the Church of *Rome* hath built upon the *foundation* of *Christianity*, to the great hazard and danger of mens *salvation*. It is not denied by the most judicious *Protestants*, but that the Church of *Rome* do hold all the *Articles* of the *Christian Faith* which are necessary to *salvation*. But that which we charge upon them, as a just ground of our separation from them, is, the *imposing* *New Doctrines and Practices upon Christians* as necessary to *salvation*, which were never taught by our Saviour, or his Apostles; and which are either directly contrary to the doctrine of *Christianity*, or too apparently destructive of a good life. And I begin

1. With their *Doctrines*. And because I have no mind to aggravate lesser matters, I will single out four or five points of *Doctrine*, which they have added to the *Christian Religion*, and which were neither taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, nor own'd in the first *Agges* of *Christianity*. And the

First which I shall mention, and which being once admitted makes way for as many errors as they please to bring in, is their *Doctrine of Infallibility*. And this they are very stout and peremptory in, tho they are not agreed among themselves where this *Infallibility* is seated; whether in the *Pope alone*, or a *Council alone*, or in *both together*, or in the *diffused body of Christians*. But they are sure they have it, tho they know not where it is.

And is this no prejudice against it? can any man think that this *priviledg* was at first conferred upon the Church of *Rome*, and that Christians in all Ages did believe it, and had constant recourse to it for determining their differences, and yet that that very Church which hath enjoyed and used it so long should now be at a loss where to find it? Nothing could have fallen out more unluckily, than that there should be such differences among them about that which they pretend to be the only means of ending all differences.

There is not the least intimation in Scripture of this *priviledg* conferr'd upon the *Roman Church*, nor do the Apostles, in all their Epistles, ever so much as give the least direction to Christians to appeal to the Bishop of *Rome* for a determination of the many differences which even in those times happen'd among them: And it is strange they should be so silent in this matter, when there were so many occasions



sons to speak of it, if our Saviour had plainly appointed such an *infallible Judge* of controversies for this very end to decide the differences that should happen among Christians, it is strange that the *ancient Fathers* in their disputes with Hereticks should never appeal to this *Judge*; nay, it is strange they should not constantly do it in all cases, it being so short and expedite a way for the ending of controversies. And this very consideration to a wise man is instead of a thousand arguments to satisfy him, that in those times no such thing was believed in the world.

Now this *Doctrine of infallibility*, if it be not true, is of so much the more pernicious consequence to Christianity, because the conceit of it does confirm them that think they have it in all their other errors; and gives them a pretence of assuming an Authority to themselves to impose their own fancies and mistakes upon the whole Christian world.

2. Their *Doctrine about Repentance*, which consists in confessing their sins to the Priest; which if it be but accompanied with any degree of *contrition* does upon *absolution* received from the Priest, put them into a state of *salvation*, tho they have lived the most lewd and debauched lives that can be imagin'd; than which nothing can be more plainly destructive of a good life. For if this be true, all the hazard that the most wicked man runs of

of his salvation is only the danger of so sudden a death as gives him no space for confession and absolution. A case that happens so rarely, that any man that is strongly addicted to his lusts will be content to venture his salvation upon this hazard ; and all the arguments to a good life will be very insignificant to a man that hath a mind to be wicked, when remission of sins may be had upon such cheap terms.

3. The *Doctrine of Purgatory*; By which they mean an estate of temporary punishments after this life, from which men may be released and translated into Heaven by the prayers of the living, and the sacrifice of the *Mass*. That this Doctrine was not known in the primitive Church, nor can be proved from Scripture, we have the free acknowledgment of as learned and eminent men as any of that Church ; which is to acknowledge that it is a superstructure upon the Christian Religion. And though in one sense it be indeed a building of *Gold and Silver* upon the foundation of Christianity, considering the vast revenues which this Doctrine (and that of Indulgences, which depends upon it) brings into that Church ; yet I doubt not, but in the Apostles sense, it will be found to be *hay and stubble*. But how groundless soever it be, it is too gainful a Doctrine to be easily parted withall.

4. The *Doctrine of Transubstantiation*. A hard word, but I would to God that were the

word

worst of it; the *thing* is much more difficult. I have taken some pains to consider other Religions that have been in the world, and I must freely declare, that I never yet in any of them met with any Article or Proposition, imposed upon the belief of men, half so unreasonable and hard to be believed as this is: And yet this in the *Romish* Church is esteemed one of the most principal Articles of the Christian Faith; though there is no more certain foundation for it in Scripture, than for our Saviour's being substantially changed into all those things which are said of him, as that he is a *rock*, a *vine*, a *door*, and a hundred other things.

But this is not all. This Doctrine hath not onely *no certain Foundation* in Scripture, but I have a far heavier charge against it, namely, that it undermines the very foundation of Christianity it self. And surely nothing ought to be admitted to be a part of the *Christian Doctrine*, which destroys the reason of our belief of the whole. And that this Doctrine does so, will appear evidently, if we consider what was the main argument which the Apostles used to convince the world of the *truth of Christianity*; and that was this, *That our blessed Saviour, the Author of this Doctrine, wrought such and such miracles, and particularly that he rose again from the dead*: And this they proved because they were eye-witnesses of

of his miracles, and had seen him and conversed with him after he was risen from the dead. But what if their senses did deceive them in this matter? then it cannot be denied but that the main proof of Christianity falls to the ground.

Well! We will now suppose (as the Church of Rome does) *Transubstantiation* have been one principal part of the Christian Doctrine which the Apostles preached. But if this Doctrine be true, then all mens senses are deceived in a plain sensible matter, when 'tis as hard for them to be deceived as in any thing in the world: For two things can hardly be imagin'd more different, than a *little bit* of water, and the *whole body* of man.

So that the Apostles perswading men to believe this Doctrine, perswaded them not to trust their senses, and yet the argument which they used to perswade them to this was built upon the direct contrary principle, that *mens senses are to be trusted*. For if they be not, then notwithstanding all the evidence the Apostles offer'd for the resurrection of our Saviour he might not be risen, and so the faith of Christians was vain. So that they represent the Apostles as absurd as is possible, when going about to perswade men out of their senses by virtue of an argument, the whole strength whereof depends upon the certainty of sense.

And



And now the matter is brought to a fair  
 trial; If the testimony of *sense* be to be relied  
 upon, then *Transubstantiation* is false; If it be  
 not, then no man is sure that Christianity is  
 true. For the utmost assurance that the A-  
 postles had of the truth of Christianity was  
 the testimony of their own senses concerning  
 our Saviour's miracles, and this testimony  
 every man hath against *Transubstantiation*.  
 From whence it plainly follows, that no man  
 (not the Apostles themselves) had more  
 reason to believe *Christianity* to be true, than  
 every man hath to believe *Transubstantiation*  
 to be false. And we who did not see our Sa-  
 viour's Miracles (as the Apostles did) and  
 have only a credible relation of them, but do  
 not see the Sacrament, have less evidence of the  
 truth of *Christianity* than of the falshood of  
*transubstantiation*.

But cannot God impose upon the senses of  
 men, and represent things to them otherwise  
 than they are? Yes, undoubtedly. And if he  
 hath revealed that he doth this, are we not  
 to believe him? Most certainly. But then we  
 ought to be assured that he hath made such a  
 revelation; which *Assurance* no man can have,  
 the certainty of sense being taken away.

I shall press the business a little farther.  
 Supposing the *Scripture* to be a *Divine Revela-*  
*tion*, and that these words (*This is my Body*)  
 they be in *Scripture*, must necessarily be ta-  
 ken

ken in the strict and literal sense; I ask not  
 What greater evidence any man has than  
 these words (*This is my Body*) are in the  
 Bible, than every man has that the Bread  
 is not chang'd in the Sacrament? Nay no man  
 has so much; for we have only the evidence  
 of *one* sense that these words are in the Bible  
 but that the Bread is not chang'd we have  
 the concurring testimony of *several* of our senses.  
 In a word, if this be once admitted that  
 the *Senses* of all men are deceiv'd in one  
 the most plain sensible matters that can be  
 there is no certain means left either to convince  
 or prove a *Divine Revelation* to men; nor  
 there any way to confute the grossest im-  
 postures in the World: For if the clear evidence  
 of all mens senses be not sufficient for this pur-  
 pose, let any man, if he can, find a better and  
 more convincing argument.

5. I will instance but in one *Doctrine* more  
 And that shall be, their *Doctrine* of *deposing*  
*Kings* in case of Heresie, and absolving the  
 Subjects from their Allegiance to them. And  
 this is not a meer *speculative Doctrine*, but  
 hath been put in practice many a time by the  
 Bishops of *Rome*, as every one knows that  
 is vers'd in History. For the troubles and con-  
 fusions which were occasion'd by this ve-  
 ry thing make up a good part of the History  
 of several Ages.

I hope no body expects that I should take the pains to shew that this was not the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, nor of the Primitive Christians. The *Papists* are many of them so far from pretending this, that in some times and places, when it is not seasonable and for their purpose, we have much a-do to perswade them that ever it was their Doctrine. But if *Transubstantiation* be their Doctrine, *this* is; for they came both out of the same Forge, I mean the Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent* the Third. And if (as they tell us) *Transubstantiation* was then establish'd, so was *this*. And indeed one would think they were Twins and brought forth at the same time, they are so like one another, both of them so mostrously unreasonable.

II. I come now in the *second* place to consider some *Practices* of the Church of *Rome*, which I am afraid will prove as bad as her *Doctrines*. I shall instance in these five.

I. Their celebrating of their Divine service in an *unknown Tongue*. And that not only contrary to the practice of the Primitive Church, and to the great end and design of Religious Worship, which is the Edification of those who are concerned in it, (and it is hard to imagine how men can be edified by what they do not understand) but likewise in direct

Contra-

Contradiction to *St. Paul*, who hath no less than a whole Chapter wherein he confutes this Practice as fully, and condemns it as plainly as any thing is condemned in the whole Bible. And they that can have the face to maintain that this Practice was not condemned by *St. Paul*, or that it was allowed and used in the first Ages of Christianity, need not be ashamed to set up for the defence of any Paradox in the World.

2. The Communion in *one kind*. And that notwithstanding that even by their own acknowledgment our Saviour instituted it in both kinds, and the Primitive Church administered it in both kinds. This I must acknowledge is no *addition* to Christianity, but a *sacriligious taking away* of an essential part of the Sacrament. For the *Cup* is as essential a part of the Institution as the *Bread*; and they might as well, and by the same Authority, take away the one as the other, and both as well as either.

3. Their worshipping of *Images*. Which practice (notwithstanding all their Distinctions about it, which are no other but what the *Heathens* used in the same case) is as point-blank against the *second Commandment*, as a *deliberate and malicious killing* of a man is against the *sixth*. But if the case be so plain, a man would think that at least the Teachers and Guides of that Church should be sensible

of



of it. Why, they are so, and afraid the people should be so too, and therefore in their ordinary *Catechisms* and *Manuals* of Devotion they leave out the *second Commandment*, and divide the *ten* into two to make up the number; lest if the common people should know their Consciences should start at the doing of a thing so directly contrary to the plain command of God.

4. The worshipping of the *bread* and *wine* in the Eucharist, out of a false and groundless persuasion, *that they are substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ*. Which if it be not true (and it hath good fortune if it be, for certainly it is one of the most incredible things in the whole World) then by the confession of several of their own learned Writers, they are guilty of *groß Idolatry*.

5. The worship and invocation of *Saints* and *Angels*; and particularly of the Virgin *Mary*, which hath now for some Ages been a principal part of their Religion. Now a man may justly wonder that so considerable a part of Religion as they make this to be should have no manner of foundation in the Scripture. Does our Saviour any where speak one word concerning the worshipping of Her? Nay, does he not take all occasions to restrain all extravagant apprehensions and imaginations concerning honour due to Her, as foreseeing the degeneracy of the Church in this

B

thing?

thing ? When he was told that his Mother and Brethren were without ; *Who* ( says he ) *are my mother and my brethren ? He that doth the will of my Father, the same is my mother, and sister, and brother.* And when the Woman brake forth into that rapture concerning the blessed Mother of our Lord, *Blessed is the woman that bare thee, and the paps that gave thee suck.* Our Saviour diverts to another thing, *Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.* Does either our Saviour or his Apostles in all their particular Precepts and Directions concerning Prayer, and the manner of it, and by whom we are to address our selves to God, give the least intimation of praying to the Virgin *Mary*, or making use of her Mediation ? And can any man believe, that if this had been the *practice* of the Church from the beginning, our Saviour and his Apostles would have been so silent about so considerable a part of Religion ; insomuch that in all the Epistles of the Apostles I do not remember that her Name is so much as once mentioned ? And yet the worship of her is at this day in the Church of *Rome*, and hath been so for several Ages, a main part of their publick worship, yea and of their private devotions too ; in which it is usual with them to say *ten Ave Marias* for one *Pater Noster* ; that is, for one Prayer they make to Almighty God they make ten addresses to the blessed Virgin ;

Virgin ; for that is the proportion observed in their *Rosaries*. He that considers *this*, and had never seen the *Bible*, would have been apt to think that there had been more said concerning *Her* in Scripture, than either concerning *God*, or our blessed *Saviour* ; and that the New Testament were full from one end to the other of precepts and exhortations to the worshipping of *Her* ; and yet when all is done, I challenge any man to shew me so much as one sentence in the whole Bible that sounds that way. And there is as little in the Christian Writers of the first three hundred years. The truth is, *this practice* began to creep in among some superstitious people about the middle of the *fourth Century* : And I remember particularly, that *Epiphanius* who lived about that time calls it the *Herefie of the Women*.

And thus I have given you some Instances of several *Doctrines* and *Practices* which the Church of *Rome* have built upon the Foundation of *Christianity*. Much more might have been said of them, but from what hath been said any man may easily discern how dangerous they are to the salvation of men.

I proceed now in the second place,

II. To consider, whether our granting a *possibility of salvation*, tho with great hazard to those in the Communion of the *Roman Church*,

and their denying it to us, be a sufficient argument and encouragement to any man to quit our Church and go to theirs. And there is the more need to consider this, because this is the great popular argument wherewith the emissaries and agents of that Church are wont to assault our people. *Your Church* (say they) *grants that a Papist may be saved; Ours denies that a Protestant can be saved; therefore it is safest to be of our Church, in which salvation by the acknowledgment of both sides is possible.*

For answer to this I shall endeavour to shew that this is so far from being a good argument that it is so intolerably weak and sophistical that any considerate man ought to be ashamed to be catch'd by it. For either it is good of itself and sufficient to perswade a man to relinquish our Church, and to pass over to theirs, without entring into the merits of the cause on either side, and without comparing the Doctrines and Practices of both the Churches together, or it is not. If it be not sufficient of itself to perswade a man to leave our Church, without comparing the Doctrines on both sides, then it is to no purpose, and there is nothing got by it. For if upon examination and comparing of Doctrines the one appear to be true and the other false, this alone is a sufficient inducement to any man to cleave to that Church where the true Doctrine is found, and



and then there is no need of this argument.

If it be said, that this argument is good in itself without the examination of the Doctrines of both Churches; this seems a very strange thing for any man to affirm, *That it is reason enough to a man to be of any Church, whatever her Doctrines and Practices be, if she do but damn those that differ from her, and if the Church that differs from her do but allow a possibility of salvation in her Communion.*

But they who use this argument, pretend that it is sufficient of itself; and therefore I shall apply my self to shew, as briefly and plainly as I can, the miserable *weakness* and *insufficiency* of it to satisfy any mans conscience or prudence to change his Religion. And to this end I shall,

1. Shew the weakness of the principle upon which this argument relies.

2. Give some *parallel instances* by which it will appear that it concludes false.

3. I shall take notice of some *gross absurdities* that follow from it.

4. Shew how unfit it is to work upon those to whom it is propounded. And

5. How improper it is to be urged by those that make use of it.

1. I shall shew the *weakness* of the principle upon which this argument relies; And that is this, *That whatever different parties in Religion agree in, is safest to be chosen.* The true conse-

quence of which *principle* if it be driven to the head, is to perswade men to forsake Christianity, and to make them take up in the principles of *natural Religion*, for in these Religions do agree. For if this *principle* be true, and signifie any thing, it is dangerous to embrace any thing wherein the several parties in Religion differ; because that only is safe and prudent to be chosen wherein all agree. So that this *argument*, if the foundation of it be good, will perswade further that those who make use of it desire it should do for it will not only make men forsake the *Protestant Religion*, but *Popery* too; and which is much more considerable, *Christianity* it self.

II. I will give some *parallel instances* by which it will clearly be seen that this *argument* concludes false. The *Donatists* denied the Baptism of the *Catholicks* to be good, but the *Catholicks* acknowledged the Baptism of the *Donatists* to be valid. So that both sides were agreed that the Baptism of the *Donatists* was good, therefore the safest way for *St. Austine* and other *Catholicks* (according to this *argument*) was to be Baptized again by the *Donatists*, because by the acknowledgment of both sides Baptism among them was valid.

But to come nearer to the Church of *Rome* than Several in that Church hold the *personal Infallibility of the Pope* and the *lawfulness of deposing and killing Kings for Heresie* to be a

that is, necessary Articles of Faith, and consequently, that whoever does not believe them cannot be saved. But a great many Papists, tho they believe these things to be no matters of Faith, yet they think those that hold them may be saved, and they are generally very favourable towards them. But now, according to this argument, they ought all to be of their opinion in these points, because both sides are agreed that *they that hold them may be saved*; but one side positively says that *they cannot be saved if they do not hold them*. But my Text furnisheth me with as good an instance to this purpose as can be desired. Paul here in the Text acknowledgeth the possibility of the salvation of those who built upon hay and stubble upon the foundation of Christianity; that they might be saved, tho with great difficulty, and as it were out of the fire. But now among those builders with hay and stubble there were those who denied the possibility of St. Paul's salvation and of those who were of his mind. We are told of some who built upon the Jewish Ceremonies and Observances upon the foundation of Christianity, and said that unless men were Circumcised and kept the Law of Moses they could not be saved. So that by this argument St. Paul and his followers ought to have gone over to those Judaizing Christians, because it was acknowledged on both sides that they might be saved. But

these *Judging Christians* were as uncharitable to *St. Paul* and other *Christians* as the Church of *Rome* is now to us, for they *say* positively *that they could not be saved*. But can any man think that *St. Paul* would have been moved by this argument, to leave a safe and certain way of salvation for that which was only possible, and that with great difficulty and hazard? The argument you see is the very same, and yet it concludes the wrong way which plainly shews that it is a *contingent argument*, and concludes uncertainly and by chance and therefore no man ought to be moved by it.

III. I shall take notice of some *gross absurdities* that follow from it. I shall mention but these two.

1. According to this principle it is always safest to be on the *uncharitable side*. And yet uncharitableness is as bad an evidence, either of a true Christian, or a true Church, as a man that would wish. *Charity* is one of the most essential marks of Christianity, and what the Apostle saith of particular Christians is as true of whole Churches, that *tho they have all Faith, yet if they have not Charity they are nothing*.

I grant that no Charity teacheth men to see others damned, and not to tell them the danger of their condition. But it is to be considered that the damning of men is a very hard thing, and therefore whenever we do it the case must be wonderfully plain. And is it



so in this matter. They of the Church of Rome cannot deny but that we embrace all the Doctrines of our Saviour, contain'd in the Apostles Creed and determined by the four first General Councils: And yet they will not allow this and a good life to put us without a possibility of salvation, because we will not submit to all the innovations they would impose upon us. And yet I think there is scarce any *Doctrine or Practice* in difference between them and us, which some or other of their most learned Writers have not acknowledged either not to be sufficiently contained in Scripture, or not to have been held and practised by the primitive Church; so that nothing can excuse their uncharitableness towards us, and they pay dear for the little advantage they get by this *argument*, for they do what they themselves lie to make themselves no Christians, that they may prove themselves the truer and more Christian Church; A *medium* which we do not desire to make use of.

2. If this *argument* were good, then by this trick a man may bring over all the world to agree with him in an error which another does not account damnable, whatever it be, provided he do but damn all those that do not hold it; and there wants nothing but confidence and uncharitableness to do this. But there any sense, that another mans boldness and want of charity should be an argument

ment to move me to be of his opinion? cannot illustrate this better, than by the difference between a skilful Physician and a Mountebank. A learned and skilful Physician is modest, and speaks justly of things: He says, that such a method of cure which hath directed is safe, and withall, that that which the Mountebank prescribes may possibly do the work, but there is great hazard and danger in it: But the Mountebank, who never talks of any thing less than *infallible cures* (and always the more Mountebank, the stronger pretence to *infallibility*) he is *positive* that that method which the Physician prescribes will destroy the Patient, but his receipt is infallible and never fails. Is there any reason in this case, that this man should carry it merely by his *confidence*? And yet if this argument be good, the safest way is to reject the Physicians advice and to stick to the Mountebanks. For both sides are agreed, that there is a possibility of cure in the Mountebank's method, but not in the Physicians; and so the whole force of the argument lies in the *confidence* of an ignorant man.

IV. This argument is very unfit to work upon those to whom it is propounded: For either they believe we say true in this, or not. If they think we do not, they have no reason to be moved by what we say. If they think we do, why do they not take

all that we say in this matter? Namely, that tho' it be possible for some in the communion of the *Roman* Church to be saved, it is very hazardous; and that they are in a safe condition already in our Church. And why then should a *bare possibility*, accompanied with infinite and apparent hazard, be an argument to any man to run into that danger? Lastly, This *argument* is very improper to be urged by those who make use of it. Half the strength of it lies in this, that we *Protestants* acknowledg that *it is possible a Papist may be saved*. But why should they lay any stress upon this? What matter is it what we hereticks say, who are so damnably mistaken in all other things? Methinks, if there were no other reason, yet because we say it, it should seem to them to be unlikely to be true. But I perceive when it serves for their purpose we have some little credit and authority among them.

By this time I hope every one is in some measure satisfied of the *weakness of this argument*, which is so transparent that no wise man can honestly use it, and he must have a very odd understanding that can be cheated by it. The truth is, it is a *casual and contingent argument*, and sometimes it concludes right, and sometimes wrong; and therefore no prudent man can be moved by it, except only in one case, when all things are so equal on both sides that

that there is nothing else in the whole world to determine him; which surely can never happen in matters of Religion necessary to be believed. No man is so weak, as not to consider in the change of his Religion, the merit of the *cause* it self; as not to examine the *Doctrines* and *Practices* of the Churches on both sides; as not to take notice of the *consistency* and *Charity* of both Parties, together with all other things which ought to move a conscientious and a prudent man: And if on enquiry there appear to be a clear advantage on either side, then this *argument* is needless and comes too late, because the work is already done without it.

Besides, that the great hazard of salvation in the *Roman Church* (which we declare to be on account of the *Doctrines* and *Practices* which I have mentioned) ought to deter any man much more from that Religion, than the acknowledged possibility of salvation; it ought to encourage any man to the embracing of it: Never did any Christian Church build so much *hay* and *stubble* upon the foundation of Christianity, and therefore *those that are saved in it must be saved, as it were, out of the fire*. And tho *Purgatory* be not meant in the Text, yet it is a Doctrine very well suited to their manner of building; for there is need of an *ignis purgatorius*, of a fire to try the work what it is, and to burn up their *hay* and *stubble*.



ubble. And I have so much Charity (and I  
 fire always to have it) as to hope, that a  
 eat many among them who live piously, and  
 ve been almost inevitably detain'd in that  
 urch by the prejudice of education and an  
 vincible ignorance, will upon a general re-  
 ntance find mercy with God; and *tho' their*  
*work suffer loss and be burnt, yet they themselves*  
*may escape, as out of the fire.* But as for those  
 who had the opportunities of coming to the  
 knowledge of the truth, if they continue in the  
 errors of that Church, or apostatize from the  
 truth, I think their condition so far from being  
 that there must be extraordinary favour-  
 able circumstances in their case to give a man  
 hopes of their salvation.

I have now done with the *two* things I pro-  
 mised to speak to. And I am sorry that the  
 necessary defence of our Religion, against the  
*useless importunities and attempts* of our ad-  
 versaries upon all sorts of persons, hath enga-  
 ged me to spend so much time in matters of  
 dispute, which I had much rather have em-  
 ployed in another way. Many of you can be  
 my witnesses, that I have constantly made it  
 my business, in this great Presence and Assem-  
 bly to plead against the *impieties and wicked-*  
*ness* of men, and have endeavoured by the best  
 arguments I could think of to gain men over  
 to a *firm belief* and serious *practice* of the main  
 things of Religion. And, I do assure you, I  
 had

had much rather perswade any one to be a good man, than to be of any party or denomination of Christians whatsoever. For I doubt not, but the *belief of the ancient Creed* provided we entertain nothing that is destructive of it, *together with a good life*, will certainly save a man; and without this no man can have reasonable hopes of salvation, nor can an infallible Church, if there were any such, be found in the world.

I have been, according to my opportunity, not a negligent observer of the *genius and Humour of the several Sects and Professions in Religion*. And upon the whole matter I do in my conscience believe the Church of *England* to be the best constituted Church in the world; and that, as to the *main* the *Doctrine and Government, and Worship* it, are excellently framed to make men *sober and Religious*: Securing men on the one hand from the wild freaks of *Enthusiasm*; and on the other, from the gross follies of *Superstition*. And our Church hath this peculiar advantage above several Professions that we know in the world, that it acknowledgeth a due and just subordination to the *civil Authority*, and hath always been untainted in its *loyalty*.

And now shall every trifling consideration be sufficient to move a man to relinquish such a Church? There is no greater disparagement to a mans understanding, no greater

ment of a light and ungenerous mind, than  
 only to change ones Religion. Religion is  
 the greatest concernment of all other, and it  
 is not every *little argument*, no nor a great  
 one about *infallibility*, nothing but very *plain*  
*and convincing evidence*, that should sway a  
 man in this case. But they are utterly inexcusa-  
 ble who make a change of such concernment  
 upon the insinuations of one side only, with-  
 out ever hearing what can be said for the  
 Church they were baptized and brought up  
 before they leave it. They that can yield  
 so easily to the impressions of every one  
 that hath a design and interest to make *Pro-*  
*fit* may at this rate of discretion change  
 their Religion twice a day, and instead of *morn-*  
*ing and evening Prayer* they may have a *morn-*  
*ing and evening Religion*.

Therefore for God's sake, and for our own  
 souls sake, and for the sake of our Reputation,  
 let us consider and *shew our selves men*; Let  
 us not suffer our selves to be shaken and carried  
 away with every wind. Let us not run our  
 selves into danger when we may be safe. Let  
 us stick to the *foundation of Religion*, the *Ar-*  
*icles of our common belief*, and build upon  
 them gold, and silver, and precious stones. I  
 mean, the *vertues and actions of a good life*; and  
 if we would do this, we should not be  
 content to set such a value upon *hay and stubble*.  
 we would sincerely endeavour to live *holy*  
 and

and vertuous Dees, we should not need to  
about for a Religion which may furnish  
with easie and indirect ways to get to Hea-  
I will conclude all with the Apostles Ex-  
tation, Wherefore my beloved brethren be  
steadfast and unmoveable, always abounding  
the work of the Lord.

Now the God of peace which brought  
gain from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ,  
great Shepherd of the sheep, by the blood of  
everlasting Covenant, make you perfect in e-  
good work, to do His will; working in you  
which is well-pleasing in his sight, through  
Christ, to whom be Glory for ever and e-  
Amen.

## FINIS

## ADVERTISEMENT

There is now in the Press a Third Volume of Ser-  
mons and Discourses; some of which never before Printed  
By Dr. Tillotson, Dean of Canterbury, in Octavo.

Also a Third Volume of the Works of the Learned  
Barrow, D. D. late Master of Trinity Collidge in Cambr-  
in Folio: Never before Printed; and are the last that  
be Published of his in English.

Both which will be Published in Easter-Term next  
Brabazon Aylmer, against the Royal Exchange in Corn